

**DISTRICT VI ADVISORY BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday  
September 13, 2004  
7:00 p.m.**

**Evergreen Recreation Center  
2700 N. Woodland  
Lounge Clubroom**

The District VI Advisory Board Meeting was held at 7:00 P.M. at Evergreen Recreation club lounge room. In attendance were the District VI City Council Member, ten (10) District Advisory Board Members, one (1) District Advisory Board youth representative, five (5) city staff, and eight (8) citizens. Approximately 24 individuals were in attendance.

**Members Present**

Paul Daemen  
Rosalie Bradley  
Jaya Escobar  
Dick Rumsey  
Maurine Willis  
Bickley Foster  
Annie Best  
Bob Schreck  
Sandra Whittington  
Bob Wine – alternate  
Garrett Harmon – youth representative

**Member Absent**

Gil Gutierrez  
Rick Shellenbarger-alternate

**Guests**

Listed at end

**Staff**

Kelli Glassman, CMO  
David Warren, Water and Sewer  
Jade Dundas, Water and Sewer  
Dale Miller, MAPD  
Patsy Ellis, Deputy City Clerk

**Council Member Fearey** called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. and welcomed guests. DAB members were asked to introduce themselves and state their representation on the board.

**Approval of Minutes**

Minutes for July 12, 2004 and August 2, 2004 were approved as submitted. (**Schreck/Rumsey 9-0**)

**Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved with the following amendment: add swearing in/oath of office for DAB VI Board Members as an off-agenda item. (**Schreck/Escobar 9-0**)

**Public Agenda**

**1. Scheduled Items**

No members of the public requested to speak.

**2. Off-Agenda Items**

Present DAB VI members were sworn in and administered the oath of office by Patsy Ellis, Deputy City Clerk.

**STAFF PRESENTATIONS**

**3. Community Police Report**

No community police report was presented.

#### **4. Siting of North Sewage Treatment Plant**

**David Warren**, Water and Sewer Department, reviewed the sewage treatment plant site evaluation committee report. The 2000 City of Wichita Master Plan Update called for the evaluation of the overall city service area over the next 10 to 30 years. This included defining the best sewer service options for the City's growth area, including a new sewage treatment plan. A committee was formed to site sewer facilities in advance of development to encourage efficient infrastructure design. This plan was presented to the DAB Boards and then citizens were appointed to a site evaluation committee with City and Engineer staff and workshops were held for the committee to evaluate sites on a variety of criteria.

Initial siting criteria included site location relative to the drainage basin, separation from residences, natural screening and potential for future development. Secondary siting criteria was based on additional costs to development the site, ability to service future development, and environmental permitting issues and concerns. Once the sites were determined, they were submitted to the State for further comment and input. These comments and outcome of site selection by the committee are now being presented to the DAB. Following this process, community education information fairs concerning the proposed sites for the sewage plant will be held before final site selection by City Council.

Based upon initial siting criteria, sites 6, 8, 5, 2, and 4 were selected. Site 8 was eliminated from the second round of evaluation because the land is privately owned and not enough land would be able to be purchased to develop the site. Site 2 was also not considered for further evaluation because it is located in the upper part of the drainage basin and would require the most amounts of pumping and expense to operate. Therefore, sites, 4, 5, and 6 were evaluated on the second set of criteria mentioned above. Based on these criteria, the site selection committee recommends that site 6 be the site chosen to locate the new sewage treatment plant, followed by site 4 and then site 5.

**Member Foster** asked what the minimum size of land desired for this facility would be. **Mr. Warren** replied that 20 acres of land is requested for the sewage treatment plant. **Member Foster** asked how large site 6 is. **Mr. Warren** stated that the northern half of site 6 is a usable size and is 20 acres. **Member Foster** also asked if site 6 was located in a flood plain. **Mr. Warren** answered that site 6 is not in a flood plain and was the selection committee's first choice because it is at the lowest point of the basin and is not on the public tax rolls. **Member Foster** also commented that that greater importance should have been given to the potential for site development as opposed to ability to service future development and that the potential for the site to be developed should have been included in the primary evaluation criteria instead of the second set of evaluation criteria. **Mr. Warren** stated that both of these criteria were given equal consideration and weight during evaluation. **Member Foster** also asked if the City owns the land for site 6. **Mr. Warren** said that the City owns the land for site 6 and that if another site was selected in which the City did not currently own the land, then at the time final site selection for the sewage treatment plant is known, the City would purchase the land. **Member Foster** further remarked that the make-up of the selection committee was 2/3 staff and consultants and he thought that the committee was going to have larger citizen representation. **Mr. Warren** replied that the selection committee has been involved with the technical part of the site selection process which requires professional knowledge and expertise of this issue and that all citizens located in the future service area will be notified of site selection and have the opportunity to voice concerns at a later date before City Council final site selection.

**Member Schreck** expressed appreciation to Bruce Barnes and his staff for all of the work they have done in this process, presented the group with a detailed breakdown of the committee's site selection evaluation results asked for clarification on the service area boundaries for this sewage treatment plant in order to determine the lowest point of the basin. **Mr. Warren** stated that the purple area outlined on the map designates the intended service area for the new plant with a west boundary of Ridge Road, which is not completely shown on the map. **Member Schreck** and **Mr. Warren** also discussed that site 2 would not be an optimal plant location site if the service area is not kept to the north of it and that the winds would put the smell of the plant directly into the Moorings housing development.

It was asked how the sites rank in terms of development cost. **Mr. Warren** replied that in terms of cost, site 4 is the cheapest and site 6 is the most expensive, although land acquisition cost were assumed to be the same for all sites. **Member Schreck** concluded that he recommends that site 4 be chosen as the primary sewage plant site due to the fact that the sewage is going to have to be pumped up to the second floor of the building regardless of the site location in relation to the drainage basin. He further added that he suggests site 5 as an alternative location because it is the least expensive to develop.

**Member Daemon** asked how the sites rank in annual operating costs. **Mr. Warren** explained that the operating cost for the new sewage plant would be similar at all three proposed sites.

**Janet Miller**, 1102 Jefferson, addressed the Board and stated that she feels that based on the siting criteria used, the site selected will probably be land that could be used for parks since park land fits all the criteria mentioned above. **Ms. Miller** stated that this is currently an issue with Pawnee Prairie Park and is urging the Board to take this into consideration so that it does not become a concern with this or other future projects.

**Jerry Prichard**, 1607 Clarence, asked if security issues have been considered when selecting this site and if the plant will be monitored continuously. **Mr. Warren** stated that although the new sewage plant will not be monitored continuously, all City facilities are secure and efforts are being made to continue to increase security for all City structures.

**Member Foster** observed that site 6 is next to Brooks Landfill, which had contaminants leak into the river and asked how this will effect monitoring of contamination for the new plant. **Mr. Warren** remarked that monitoring is already required for groundwater remediation in order to address pollution concerns, so no further monitoring will have to be done once the plant is operating. **Member Foster** also expressed concerns that not enough public input has been received by the Board to make a proper recommendation at this time. **Councilmember Fearey** reminded the Board that public input will be heard before the City Council make a final plant site selection.

**\*\*\*\*\*Action Taken: DAB VI motioned that site 4 be recommended as the primary site to locate the new sewage treatment plant and site 5 as an alternate location site (Schreck/Matney), but the motion was not voted on. DAB VI then made a substitute motion to wait to recommend a site location for the proposed sewage treatment plan until a DAB VI public meeting is held to receive further public input (Foster/Escobar 7-2 (Daemon/Best))**

## **5. Offender Re-Entry**

**Margie Phelps**, Kansas Department of Corrections, presented this item. Each year, approximately 1,500 offenders return to the community after they have finished their prison term. As a result of a Wichita Assembly, an implementation plan for safe reintegration of area offenders was developed and presented to the City Council on April 6, 2004. The City Council expressed concern with the pilot project and disbanding the Alternative Correctional Housing Board (ACHB). Therefore, the City Council referred the item to District Advisory Boards for further comment and recommendation.

Through city, county and state funds, a pilot project will be designed to work with the highest risk offenders a year before their release to determine a preparation plan for their re-entry into society to address housing, and other needs. Job preparedness, marketing and development will be addressed by keeping a list of those companies who have hired offenders in the past. From this list, an offender's job skills and needs will be assessed in order to make a safe and mutually beneficial employment match. Federal money will be available to train these offenders. These offenders will be monitored until no longer necessary and data will be collected on this program and reported back to governing bodies to determine the success of this plan.

**Member Foster** asked what the rate of offenders returning to prison after release is. **Ms. Phelps** stated that this information is not broken down by county, but usually about 50% of offenders return to prison within the first year; 75% of high risk offenders return to prison for 90 days or more and 14% of offenders commit and get convicted for new felonies.

**Member Schreck** asked if this has been done anywhere else. **Ms. Phelps** replied that each state has been given grant money for this purpose and that funds were given to Shawnee County, KS, where an offender re-entry model was successfully implemented. **Member Schreck** also questioned how many people would be on the board to oversee this project. **Ms. Phelps** explained that the board would essentially be made up of the same individuals that were on the offender re-entry taskforce.

**Member Best** and several other Board members stated that offenders are coming into the community and she is supportive of trying a new approach to make their re-integration into the community successful.

**Member Rumsey** commented that the ACHB should not be disbanded. **Member Bradley** agreed and stated that the ACHB has a lot of knowledge that should continue to be used in this process. **Ms. Phelps** stated that the taskforce is not recommending the disbanding of the ACHB and that this has been listed as a taskforce recommendation in error.

**\*\*\*\*\*Action Taken: DABG VI motioned to support the pilot offender reentry project (Best/Willis 9-0) and to continue the activities of the Alternative Correctional Housing Board (Foster/Rumsey 9-0)**

## PLANNING

### **6. ZON2004-00045**

**Dale Miller**, MAPD, presented a requested zone change from “B” and “SF-5” to “LC” for .43 acres north of Douglas and east of West Street for the expansion of Hanna Heating and Air Conditioning which is located on the abutting property to the east. MAPC staff recommends that this rezoning request be approved subject to replatting within one year.

**Member Bradley** asked if 1<sup>st</sup> Street in this area was vacated. **Mr. Miller** explained that there is a partial driveway which is not really 1<sup>st</sup> Street and the right-of-way stops at the east end of the approach.

**Member Schreck** stated that this must be replatted correctly so that a building is not placed there and then have to be torn down in the future to allow for right-of-way dedication. **Mr. Miller** commented that the building owner is aware that this area is being worked on and that 60 feet right-of-way dedication and 30 feet drainage easement will be retained and the building will be aligned with others on the block.

**\*\*\*\*\* Action Taken: DAB motioned to approve the rezoning proposal (Rumsey/Willis 9-0)**

### **7. Midtown Rezoning Initiative**

**Janet Miller**, Historic Midtown Citizens Association, presented the neighborhood plan and rezoning proposal and process. **Ms. Miller** stated that this initiative is led by citizens with cooperation from the City and County and has been incorporated into the MAPC Comprehensive Plan.

**Ms. Miller** explained that the first objective for this initiative is to rezone the Mid-Town area, since current use of the buildings in this area do not match the zoning classifications for these facilities. There has been one public meeting so far on this issue with several more to follow. Through meetings, newspaper articles and mailings, it is hoped that area property owners will consent to have their property properly rezoned in order to have the zoning scheme in this area be consistent with logical use for the buildings. Although some owners have already chosen not to go through this process, this process has been successful in the City’s Delano District.

**Member Schreck** asked if Via Christi has been consulted on this issue and if they will be accommodated if they want to expand their property in the future. **Ms. Miller** responded that Via Christi has been invited to participate in this effort, but has not done so thus far, although they do have an informal agreement stating that they will not expand to the north in this neighborhood.

**Member Rumsey** asked if all residents have to state that they do not want to be rezoned. **Ms. Miller** said that those citizens not wanting to rezone their property could call, write or personally visit the MAPC by the end of October 2004 to have their name put on a list to be contacted at some point in the future to officially implement the rezoning process. **Councilmember Fearey** added that those not interested in rezoning their property must sign a paper to request to opt out of this project. **Member Rumsey** further inquired about current uses of such buildings as duplexes. **Ms. Miller** responded that even if property is rezoned, until the property is not used in over a year or is over 50% destroyed, the structure will continue to be used as desired and not be used in ways stipulated by the new zoning classification, including industrial zoned properties.

Furthermore, no property will be rezoned to a higher zoning category, only a lower zoning classification.

**Member Escobar** remarked that she would like to see a map showing what the area is currently zoned compared with what is being proposed. **Ms. Miller** replied that this project is in the preliminary stages; so there is no finalized zoning plan to show at this time.

**Member Daemon** commented that he is not comfortable with the fact that those who do not vocalize opposition to rezoning will automatically be rezoned, since some may not be able to understand what is being done due to language barrier. **Ms. Miller** responded that material concerning this process has been distributed in English, Spanish and Vietnamese and that it will be staff's responsibility to make sure that those who oppose rezoning their property sign the appropriate document. She further stated that property owners may also sit down with a city planner who will explain this process in greater detail so that it can be better understood.

\*\*\*\*\***Action Taken:** Receive and file.

8. **Petition to Pave Fairview, north of 30<sup>th</sup> Street North**

The applicant has decided to reconfigure the plat and has withdrawn the petition.

**BOARD AGENDA**

9. **First and Second Pro-Tem**

Board members selected a first and second Pro-Tem to serve in **Councilmember Fearey's** absence.

**Member Rumsey** was chosen as first Pro-Tem (**Schreck/Bradley 9-0**)

**Member Schreck** was elected second Pro-Tem (**Best/Rumsey 9-0**)

10. **Problem Properties**

DAB members were asked to contact the neighborhood assistant if there are any problem properties that they wish to report.

11. **Neighborhood Reports**

**Member Whittington** announced a fiesta that would take place Tuesday, September 14, 2004 at Asbury United Methodist Church, 2801 W. 15<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Member Bradley** said that State and County elected office candidate forms are now available. She also announced that there will be a satellite broadcast of a presentation entitled, "Drugs and Society: The True Cost to You" on September 15, 2004 from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. at the KU Medicine Center-Wichita Santa Fe Room, 1010 N. Kansas.

**Member Foster** informed the group that the 21<sup>st</sup> Street Revitalization Study is nearing completion and that the consultants and MAPD will put together a final draft by the September 21, 2004 meeting from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at Minisa Park. The 21<sup>st</sup> Street Business Association is doing a marketing study to make a 5-lane road through this area with no parking on the side. It has also been discussed to have two lanes going eastbound with parallel parking and traffic eastbound would turn and go north and an island would be created with bump outs,

which would reduce the area needed for crossing. However, the effects of this proposal on businesses in the area are still being studied. **Member Matney** commented that if 21<sup>st</sup> Street was a 5-lane street through this area, the buildings would have to be built back further and have more sidewalk access, with an entrance at 21<sup>st</sup> Street and Broadway. **Member Foster** added that the area to the south of this would be an international area with indoor and outdoor shopping, a defined architectural theme and music. He further said that this project should be finalized by December 22 to go before the MAPD, Sedgwick County Commission and Wichita City Council. **Member Foster** also gave an update on the railroad tracks at 29<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that the railroad would close off at 29<sup>th</sup> Street. Since the railroad is not allowed to stop within 500 feet of traffic, they will lose 1000 feet of switching guards. Moreover, the railroad tracks at 21<sup>st</sup> Street and Broadway will be moved to the east.

### **ISSUE UPDATES FROM COUNCIL MEMBER FEAREY**

**Councilmember Fearey** announced that she will not be present at the October 4, 2004 DAB VI meeting and also distributed copies of *The Riverside Booster* to the Board.

With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

### **GUESTS**

Berle Willis	3834 Woodrow	
Wendell Turner	2623 Fairview	
Jerry Prichard	1607 Clarence	
Bruce Barnes, PEC	303 S. Topeka	
Kirk Miller, KE Miller Engineering	516 S. Market	
Margie Phelps, KDOC	900 SW Jackson, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor	Topeka, KS 66612
Debbie Harmon	3602 N. Meridian	
Janet Miller, HMCA	1102 Jefferson	